US ERA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

JUL 2 1987

		1.3	va	te out of	EAB
			Sh	aughnessy	No: 090501 080803 100101 035506
To:	Product	iamporcaro Manager ation Division		; ; ; L	101101 108801 080807 036101
From:	Environ Exposure	K. Offutt, Chi mental Processe Assessment Br Evaluation Divi	es and Guid		041405 ction
Attach	ed, pleas	se find the EAB	review of	• • •	
Reg./F	ile #:			. • .	-
Chemica	al Name:	Alachlor &	Alternative	s: Atraz	zine, Cyana-
		zine, Linur	on, Metribu	ızin, Metc	olachlor,
	<u>*</u>	Simazine, T	rifluralin,	, Butylate	e (ground
•		water monito			
Type Pr	oduct:	Herbicide			
Product	Name:	Alachlor & a	alternative	s	
Company	Name:	Monsanto	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•
Purpose	:	Review of 19	985 Surface	and Grou	ınd Water
<u> </u>	Screening	g Results for S			
Action	Code:	870	EAB #(s)	: 70164 a	nd 70240
Date Red	ceived: <u>1/</u>	/5/87 & 2/5/87	TAIS Cod	e:	
Date Con	mpleted:_	7/1/87	Total Re	viewing T	ime:7
Monitori	ing study	requested:	. ` <del>_</del>		
Monitori	ng study	voluntarily s	ubmitted:_	<u>x</u>	
Deferral	s to:	Ecolog	ical Effec	ts Branch	
		Residu	e Chemistr	y Branch	. ,
	e Se	X Toxico	logy Branch	h .	

#### 1. CHEMICALS:

			Shaughnessy	No.
Common	names:	Alachlor	090501	<del></del>
		Atrazine	080803	
		Cyanazine	100101	
		Linuron	035506	
		Metribuzin	101101	
		Metolachlor	108801	
		Simazine	080807	
		Trifluralin	036101	
		Butylate (Ground	041405	
		Water Monitorin		
		Only)		

#### 2. TEST MATERIAL:

Surface and/or ground water

## 3. STUDY/ACTION TYPE:

Review of 1985 Surface and Ground Water Screening Results for chemicals, listed above, which are alternatives to Monsanto's herbicide product, alachlor. This study was voluntarily conducted by Monsanto and submitted in response to the May 7, 1986, request by EPA.

## 4. STUDY IDENTIFICATION:

Title:

"Analytical Results from Surface and Ground Water Monitoring for Selected Herbicides Conducted by Monsanto Company During 1985," Four Volumes, R.D. No. 691.

Author:

Compiled by S.R. Meunch

Submitted By: Issue Date:

Monsanto Company June 25, 1986 19,770 and 19,982

Pack No.: Record No.:

187,391 and 189,067 Accession No.: 265,683 and 265,683

EAB No.:

70,164 and 70,240

#### 5. REVIEWED BY:

Linda L. Kutney

Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section, EAB 7/2/87

#### 6. APPROVED BY:

Carolyn K. Offutt, Chief

Environmental Processes and Guidelines Section

Exposure Assessment Branch, HED (TS-769C)

7/2/87

#### 7. CONCLUSIONS:

Quantitative conclusions concerning the amount of atrazine, cyanazine, linuron, metolachlor, metribuzin, simazine, trifluralin, and butylate in surface and ground water monitored by Monsanto are included in the attached tables. Data submitted are insufficient to allow validation. Exact sample locations must also be clarified for the reported data.

Although the monitoring data are inconclusive due to problems in quality control and proper confirmatory analyses, the following generalizations appear to be true:

- a. Herbicides found in untreated, raw surface water also appear to be present in treated, tap water.
- b. Concentrations of herbicides in tap water often are almost as high as concentrations in raw water.
- c. Surface water concentrations (unconfirmed) of atrazine were, by far, the highest-up to 22.0 ppb maximum, with an annualized mean concentration (AMC) or estimated yearly average concentration of 5.98 ppb. Contamination due to cyanazine and metolachlor peaked at maximums of 8.8 ppb and 9.2 ppb with AMC's estimated at 2.3 ppb and 2.0 ppb, respectively. Simazine, linuron and metribuzin maximum concentrations were 1.2 ppb, 1.0 ppb and 0.7 ppb, respectively, and had estimated AMC's between 0.2-0.4 ppb. Only trifluralin was reported to be less than or equal to the detection limit (0.2 ppb) at all locations.
- d. Ground water screening (unconfirmed) for July 1985 samples showed that maximum concentrations were atrazine, 6.5 ppb; cyanazine, 4.5 ppb; metolachlor, 0.4 ppb; and butylate, 0.4 ppb. No more than than 14 of 243 wells screened were positive for any of the four herbicides monitored (this is less than 6% of the total wells).
- e. Maximum confirmed concentration of ground water sampled October 1985 showed metolachlor contamination in a well site in Hertford, NC was 48.0 ppb (this site had no detectable screening values reported in July 1985)! This amount is over 100x higher than the highest amount of metolachlor found in any well during previous July 1985 screening. Monsanto should clarify whether any sample was taken in Hertford, NC in July 1985. Maximum confirmed ground water contamination for atrazine was 2.0 ppb. Either no confirmation test was completed for cyanazine or butylate or neither pesticide was present in October 1985. Monsanto should clarify which is the

case in a revised submission. They should make clear also exactly how many samples were taken at any time, and how many of those were positive. This is not always clear from their tables.

The analytical methods used to detect the above eight herbicides in surface and well water were not reviewed because insufficient quality assurance information was provided.

## 3. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The monitoring data submitted for atrazine, cyanazine, linuron, metolachlor, metribuzin, simazine, trifluralin, and butylate should be considered unvalidated and preliminary.

Additional quality assurance information is necessary to validate the data, including information listing which positive samples were confirmed to be positive with the more reliable gas chromatography/mass spectrophotometry (GC/MS) method (if any) and which samples were unconfirmed positives (See Discussion section for details).

The specific city and state location for each sample should be clarified by Monsanto in a revised submission for the results to be meaningful.

If the quality assurance and location information is adequately furnished in a future submission from Monsanto, the data may be validated following their review.

The Agency may wish to consider omitting these data from the Alachlor PD4 due to the uncertainty of the data. If the data are included, appropriate language should describe the uncertainty of the reported values.

#### 9. BACKGROUND:

Surface and ground water screening of herbicides atrazine, cyanazine, linuron, metolachlor, metribuzin, simazine, trifluralin, and butylate was reported by Monsanto (competitor to the manufacturers of the alternative herbicides). This study was voluntarily conducted by Monsanto and submitted in duplicate, in response to a May 7, 1986, request by EPA, first on January 5, 1987, and then later on February 5, 1987. The Special Review Branch has requested that EAB complete this review for consideration in developing the Alachlor PD4. A preliminary summary of the data was submitted to David Giamporcaro, Product Manager, on January 22, 1987. In response to another request by EPA (June 26, 1987),

Monsanto sent a July 1, 1987, letter which waives any claims to confidentiality of the data in the subject report.

#### 10. DISCUSSION:

## A. Analytical Methodology

Review of the analytical methodology used for the eight herbicides monitored in this study will be considered if additional information is received in future submissions by Monsanto. Although the methods may be satisfactory, not enough quality assurance information is given for each of the eight herbicides monitored to comment on the validity of the data or the methodology.

Additional quality assurance data is needed as follows:

- \* Purity of all reference standards.
- \* The recovery percentages which were obtained for each of the eight herbicides at concentrations comparable to those found in the samples.
- \* Analytical results for "negative control" or blank samples.
- \* Analytical results for "positive control" or spiked samples.
- \* All duplicate results. Needed to determine repeatability of results (as opposed to a simple average, which was given).
- \* Plots of standard concentrations versus machine reading -to determine level of skill and care of the analyst as
  well as method reliability for all herbicides.
- \* Plots of sample concentrations (including duplicate value) and machine reading to determine level of skill and care of the analyst as well as method reliability for all herbicides.
- \* Sample calculations for each herbicide.
- \* Storage stability data for each herbicide.
- \* Data concerning the amount of time between sampling and analysis for each herbicide.
- \* Presence or absence of confirmatory results such as GC/MS to ensure that positive values are really positive and to determine the amount of error associated with their quantitative values.

- \* Data listing preliminary screening values and the corresponding values resulting from the confirmatory method for each herbicide to help detect any bias in the screening method which is not present in the longer, but more accurate, confirmatory method.
- \* Exact city and state for each location submitted. All the surface water results listed only the city name. In addition, the exact identity of ground water samples often appears as if it may be in error.

Because of the almost total lack of demonstrated quality assurance information given with this submission, this monitoring information should be considered only as a possible supplement to validated studies. Unless the petitioner submits additional quality assurance information, and confirms the reliability of the data, the data probably are not appropriate for the basis of regulatory decision by the Agency.

These data should be considered for  $\underline{\text{exclusion}}$  in the PD4 for the reasons given below:

- 1) the questionable validity of the data,
- 2) the lack of proper quality assurance information,
- 3) the analytical methods are not validated, and
- 4) the lack of definite identity of samples.

#### B. Monitoring Results

Monsanto's monitoring of <u>surface water</u> herbicides should be considered preliminary due to lack of quality control information. The reported results are incomplete without additional clarification of the state associated with each city listed by "location." None of the surface water positive results were reported to be validated with a confirmatory method.

The identity of the locations listed for all the surface water monitoring were given by city only; no identity of state was mentioned anywhere in this review. It is very likely that the states associated with these cities correspond to those which were reported previously, in the PD 2/3, namely the following:

City Screened Surface Water Herbicide Contamination	for	Most Likely State for the Reported City
BETHANY		MO
BLANCHESTER	9	ОН
BREESE	;	IL
CHARLESTON		IL
CLARINDA		IA
COLUMBUS		OH
DAVENPORT		IA
DECATUR		IL
GREENVILLE		NC
KANKAKEE		IL
LEXINGTON		MO
MARION		IL
MI. CITY		IN
MONROE		MI
MOUNT VERNON	$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$	IN
MUNCIE		IN
PIQUA		ОН
QUINCY		IL
RICHMOND		IN
ROANOKE RAPDS		NC
TOLEDO	*	ОН
U OF IOWA	•	IA
WYACONDA		MO
YPSILANTI		MI

However, the exact location of these surface water monitoring samples should be explicitly reported in a revised submission from Monsanto.

Monsanto monitoring of ground water herbicides should also be considered preliminary due to quality control questions. Although both city and state are given for the ground water data, they should be verified if they are to have any meaning; e.g., is it really Decatur, IN, or IL; is it Tift, GA, or should it be Tifton, GA? Although ground water results for October 1985 were reportedly confirmed with GC/MS, the corresponding screening results were not given. No conclusion may be reached, therefore, by contrasting screening results with GC/MS results. Accuracy of all the screening results, including all the surface water results and all the July 1985 well water results, should be validated by confirmatory analyses and submission of QA/QC information. It is significant that only four out of twelve locations which screened positive in July of 1985 were confirmed to be positive in October of that same year, i.e., less than 34% were confirmed positive in the later month. Insufficient data is present to determine whether this is due to seasonal variance in ground water contamination or excessive positive samples reported by

the screening method. If the latter is the case, the number of positive herbicides reported may well be overestimated by the screening method at least by a factor of 3x higher than they should have been.

Review of the unvalidated screening of the selected herbicides in surface water shows that when herbicides are present in raw water, they are usually also present in finished (tap) water. Monsanto data suggests that the treatment of raw water usually reduces the maximum concentration of the herbicide only by 50% or less in the finished water. Details concerning the level of water treatment at each location were not given; however, it is likely that use of granualted activated carbon filters could reduce the herbicide concentration in finished water (This is an extremely expensive solution which is not practical in many locations).

Details concerning reported values are summarized in the tables.

Briefly, in finished surface water, maximum values of herbicides and annualized mean concentrations (AMCs) were as follows:

Herbicide	Finished Surface Maximum Weekly Concentration (ppb)	Water Annualized Mean Concentration (ppb)
Atrazine	22.20 (in Blanchester)	5.98
Cyanazine	8.78 (in Blanchester)	2.28
Linuron	0.96 (in Picqua)	0.22
Metolachlor	9.15 (in Columbus)	2.05
Metribuzin	0.72 (in Mt. Vernon)	0.21
Simazine	1.24 (in Richmond)	0.37
Trifluralin	<pre>     Detection limit at all     locations (&lt;0.20 ppb) </pre>	<pre>     Detection limit at all     locations (&lt;0.20 ppb) </pre>
Alachlor*	10.9* (in Columbus, OH)	1.4*

<sup>\*</sup>from "Alachlor Special Review Technical Support Document" (Table E)

In ground water, the following results were reported (See attached table for more details):

<u>Herbicide</u>	Ground Water Maximum Concentration (ppb) 7/85 Screening	Maximum Concentration Confirmed 10/85 (ppb)
Atrazine	6.5 (in Decatur, IN) Only 14 of 243 wells were positive	2.0 (in Decatur, IN)
<sup>'</sup> Butylate	0.38 (in Miller, GA) Only 1 of 243 wells was positive	<del>44 55 84</del>
Cyanazine	4.5 (in Iroquois, IL) Only 3 of 243 wells were positive	
Metolachlor	0.37 (in Pulaski, IN) Only 12 of 243 wells were positive	48.0 (in Hartford, NC)
Alachlor*	1.33* (in Hertford, NC)	21.8*(in Pulaski, IN)

<sup>\*</sup>from "Review of Ground Water Monitoring Study," completed 4/17/87, by Matthew Lorber, EAB #6871-2

The "Analytical Results from Surface and Ground Water Monitoring for Selected Herbicides Conducted by Monsanto During 1985," submitted JUNE 25, 1986 (4 Volumes), is summarized in the attached tables. They contain monitoring information for the following chemicals in surface and ground water:

ATRAZINE
CYANAZINE
LINURON
METOLACHLOR
METRIBUZIN
SIMAZINE
TRIFLURALIN
BUTYLATE (GROUND WATER ONLY)

# 11. COMPLETION OF ONE-LINER:

Not applicable.

## 12. CBI APPENDIX:

Not applicable.

# TABLE 1 - ATRAZINE IN CWS

#### FINISHED WATER

LOCATION BETHANY	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED	MEAN	CONC*
	7/17/85	0.48-0.88	0.55-0.57		
BLANCHESTER	7/10/85	<0.20-22.20	5.96-5.98		
BREESE	6/6/85	<0.20-19.07	2.00-2.02		
CHARLESTON	7/3+10/85	<0.20-0.35	0.22-0.26		
CLARINDA	7/3/85	<0.20-2.15	0.61-0.67		
COLUMBUS	5/8/85	0.57-17.97	4.11-4.13		
DAVENPORT	5/14/85	<0.20-0.56	0.09-0.22		* .
DECATUR	7/16/85	<0.20-1.20	0.52-0.58		
GREENVILLE	4/24/85	<0.20-0.37	0.02-0.20		
KANKAKEE	6/4/85	<0.20-1.64	0.37-0.44		
LEXINGTON	5/29/85	<0.20-3.11	0.59-0.63		
MARION	8/21/85	<0.20-1.59	0.48-0.55		
MI. CITY	none	<0.20			•
MONROE	12/25/85	<0.20-0.26	0.00-0.20		
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-4.62	0.00-0.20		•
MUNCIE	5/2	<0.20-7.31	0.60-0.68		
PIQUA	5/8		0.68-0.78		
QUINCY	6/10	<0.20-1.73	0.38-0.44		
RICHMOND		<0.20-1.24	0.41 - 0.45		
	5/8	-10.29	2.04-2.09		
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
TOLEDO	11/27	-0.24	0.01-0.20		
U OF IOWA	5/29	<0.20-2.95	0.57-0.61		
WYACONDA	4/12		0.60-0.63		
YPSILANTI	none		0.00-0.20		

LOCATION	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*
BETHANY	5/2/85	0.48-1.13	0.63-0.66
BLANCHESTER	7/10/85	0.30-22.77	6.38-6.40
BREESE	6/6/85	<0.20-18.84	1.97-2.00
CHARLESTON	6/12/85	<0.20-0.60	0.29-0.32
CLARINDA	6/26/85	<0.20-3.86	0.65-0.71
COLUMBUS	5/8/85	0.99-24.31	4.67-4.69
DAVENPORT	5/14/85	<0.20-1.20	0.28-0.33
DECATUR	7/16/85	<0.20-1.52	0.56-0.61
GREENVILLE	4/17/85	<0.20-0.59	0.06-0.21
KANKAKEE	6/4/85	<0.20-1.42	0.40-0.45
LEXINGTON	5/29/85	0.23-5.43	0.96-1.00
MARION	7/10/85	<0.20-1.31	0.58-0.62
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	7/31+8/7	<0.20-0.58	0.18-0.27
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-4.80	0.74-0.79
MUNCIE	-5/2	<0.20-4.52	0.60-0.65
PIQUA	5/8	0.21-2.42	0.60-0.62
QUINCY	4/29	<0.20-1.33	0.40-0.45
RICHMOND	5/8	-9.07	2.23-2.27
ROANOKE RAPDS		0.26	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	11/18	-0.35	
U OF IOWA	5/29		0.10-0.22
WYACONDA	5/14		0.60-0.65
YPSILANTI			0.86-0.90
TESTIMATI	7/16	<0.20-0.31	0.06-0.21

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

#### Table 2 - CYANAZINE IN CWS

#### FINISHED WATER

LOCATION BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT DECATUR GREENVILLE KANKAKEE LEXINGTON	DATE OF MAX 7/17/85 6/26/85 4/26/85 6/19/85 7/3/85 5/15/85 7/23/85 6/26/85 7/03/85 7/9/85 5/22/85	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)  0.53-1.02  <0.20- 8.78  <0.20- 2.68  <0.20-0.23  <0.20-1.30  <0.20- 4.04  <0.20-0.25  <0.20-0.33  <0.20-0.33  <0.20-0.59	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*  0.65-0.67  2.22-2.28  0.35-0.46  0.00-0.20  0.33-0.43  0.58-0.67  0.03-0.20  0.10-0.22  0.00-0.20  0.06-0.21  0.07-0.22
MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE PIQUA QUINCY RICHMOND ROANOKE RAPDS TOLEDO U OF IOWA WYACONDA YPSILANTI	7/17/85 none none 5/10 5/2 5/1 4/29 5/8 none none 5/21 8/19	<pre>&lt;0.20-0.29 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20-0.91 &lt;0.20-1.36 &lt;0.20-0.44 &lt;0.20-0.45 &lt;0.20-3.67 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20 &lt;0.20-1.54 &lt;0.20-0.28 &lt;0.20</pre>	0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.13-0.27 0.05-0.23 0.09-0.23 0.10-0.24 0.65-0.73 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.21-0.32 0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20

LOCATION	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*
BETHANY	4/25/85	0.76-1.66	0.85-0.89
BLANCHESTER	7/17/85	<0.20-12.44	2.97-3.02
BREESE	4/26/85	<0.20- 2.76	0.30-0.40
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
CLARINDA	6/26/85	<0.20-2.60	0.45-0.52
COLUMBUS	5/8/85	<0.20- 6.40	0.80-0.89
DAVENPORT		<0.20-0.49	0.06-0.21
DECATUR	7/23/85	<0.20-0.38	0.09-0.23
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE		<0.20-0.45	0.04-0.21
	5/15/85	<0.20-1.32	0.13-0.28
MARION	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
	•	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	none		0.15-0.30
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-1.55	
MUNCIE	5/2	<0.20-1.35	0.08-0.24
PIQUA	5/8	<0.20-0.85	0.16-0.28
QUINCY	4/29	<0.20-0.76	0.09-0.24
RICHMOND	5/8	<0.20-4.41	0.91-0.99
ROANOKE RAPDS	•	<0.20	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA	5/21	<0.20-1.51	0.23-0.34
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
		<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00 0.20

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

# TABLE 3 - LINURON IN CWS

## FINISHED WATER

LOCATION	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	0.00-0.20
BETHANY	none	<0.20	
BLANCHESTER	6/19/85	<0.20- 0.22	
BREESE	6/06/85	<0.20- 0.30	0.00-0.20
CHARLESTON	none		0.01-0.20
CLARINDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
COLUMBUS		<0.20	0.00-0.20
DAVENPORT	6/19/85	<0.20- 0.87	0.04-0.22
	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
DECATUR	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
LEXINGTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MARION	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MOUNT VERNON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MUNCIE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
PIQUA	6/12	<0.20-0.96	0.03-0.22
QUINCY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
RICHMOND	7/3	<0.20- 0.20	0.01-0.20
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA WYACONDA	5/1 none	<0.20-0.23 <0.20	0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20

LOCATION BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT DECATUR GREENVILLE KANKAKEE LEXINGTON MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE PIQUA QUINCY RICHMOND ROANOKE RAPDS TOLEDO	DATE OF MAX 1/08/86 6/05/85 6/06/85 none none 6/19/85 12/16/85 5/13/85 6/26/85 6/18/85 12/04/85 none none 8/21/85 9/04 6/6 none none 6/12 none 12/16	<0.20-2.66	ANNUALIZED MEAN CO 0.02-0.20 0.08-0.22 0.28-0.39 0.00-0.20 0.45-0.53 0.02-0.21 0.17-0.27 0.08-0.24 0.03-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.13-0.25 0.04-0.22 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20	DNC*
			0.00-0.20	
U OF IOWA	8/7	<0.20-0.20	0.00-0.20	
WYACONDA YPSILANTI	none 5/2	<0.20 <0.20-0.57	0.00-0.20 0.03-0.21	

<sup>\*</sup>LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

# TABLE 4 - METOLACHLOR IN CWS

## FINISHED WATER

LOCATION	DATE OF MAY	DANCE OF COMMISSION	
BETHANY	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	
BLANCHESTER	7/03/85	<0.20	0.00-0.20
BREESE	6/06/85	<0.20- 0.32	0.08-0.23
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.22-0.34
CLARINDA	6/12	<0.20-0.82	0.00-0.20 0.11-0.26
COLUMBUS	6/19/85	<0.20 9.15	2.03-2.05
DAVENPORT	5/14	<0.20-0.23	0.00-0.20
DECATUR	5/13	<0.20-0.74	0.26-0.33
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	7/2	<0.20-0.59	0.12-0.26
LEXINGTON	5/1	<0.20-0.25	0.02-0.20
MARION	6/20	<0.20-0.43	0.11-0.24
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-1.15	0.10-0.25
MUNCIE	05/2	<0.20-1.12	0.21-0.34
PIQUA	8/28	<0.20-0.34	0.01-0.20
QUINCY	06/10	<0.20-0.31	0.02-0.20
RICHMOND	5/8	<0.20- 1.25	0.26-0.38
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA	5/21	<0.20-0.87	0.09-0.25
WYACONDA	nońe	<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20

LOCATION BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT DECATUR GREENVILLE KANKAKEE LEXINGTON MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE	DATE OF MAX none 6/05-12 6/06/85 6/12 6/12 5/08/85 05/14/85 7/09/85 6/19/85 10/22/85 05/29/85 06/20 none none 9/04 5/30	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)  <0.20 <0.20-0.62 <0.20-0.22 <0.20-0.68 <0.20-0.55 <0.20-0.55 <0.20-0.82 <0.20-0.23 <0.20-0.23 <0.20-0.47 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20-0.47 <0.20-1.94	ANNUALIZED NO.00-0.20 0.11-0.26 0.27-0.39 0.00-0.20 0.09-0.25 2.40-2.43 0.01-0.20 0.34-0.40 0.01-0.20 0.13-0.26 0.14-0.28 0.11-0.24 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.13-0.25 0.26-0.38	MEAN	CONC*
			0.13-0.26		•
			0.14 - 0.28		
	06/20	<0.20-0.48	0.11-0.24		4
	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		. •
MOUNT VERNON	9/04	<0.20-0.47			, :
MUNCIE	5/30	<0.20-1.94			
PIQUA	08/28	<0.20-0.41	0.02-0.20		
QUINCY	05/20	<0.20-0.35	0.02-0.20	•	
RICHMOND	6/12	<0.20-1.92	0.34-0.46		
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
TOLEDO	none	<0.20	0.05-0.20		
U OF IOWA	5/9	<0.20-1.80	0.18-0.31		
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
5 .	*	· · · · · · ·			

OW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; HE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

## TABLE 5 - METRIBUZIN IN CWS

# FINISHED WATER

LOCATION  BETHANY  BLANCHESTER  BREESE  CHARLESTON  CLARINDA  COLUMBUS  DAVENPORT  DECATUR  GREENVILLE  KANKAKEE  LEXINGTON  MARION  MI. CITY  MONROE  MOUNT VERNON  MUNCIE  PIQUA  QUINCY  RICHMOND	DATE OF MAX none none none none none none none non	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)  <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20	0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.01-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20
	5/22+29		

#### RAW WATER

LOCATION	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED M	IEAN	CONC*
BETHANY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		-
BLANCHESTER	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
BREESE	6/06/85	<0.20- 1.81	0.09-0.25		
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
CLARINDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
COLUMBUS	6/19/85	<0.20- 1.91	0.27-0.35		
DAVENPORT	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
DECATUR	5/06/85	<0.20-0.31	0.01-0.20		
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
KANKAKEE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		•
LEXINGTON	05/29/85	<0.20-0.40	0.01-0.20		
MARION	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
MOUNT VERNON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
MUNCIE	6/13	<0.20-0.68	0.02-0.21		
PIQUA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
QUINCY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
RICHMOND	5/01	<0.20-1.12	0.08-0.23		
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
TOLEDO	12/16	<0.20-2.66	0.05-0.24		
U OF IOWA	7/10	<0.20-0.28	0.01-0.20		
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	-	
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		

LOW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; THE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

# TABLE 6 - SIMAZINE IN CWS

## FINISHED WATER

LOCATION BETHANY BLANCHESTER BREESE CHARLESTON	DATE OF MAX none 8/21 7/11	RANGE OF CONC(PPB) <0.20 <0.20-0.71 <0.20-0.50	ANNUALIZED 0.00-0.20 0.06-0.21 0.06-0.22	MEAN	CONC*
CLARINDA	none none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
COLUMBUS	6/05/85	<0.20	0.00-0.20		*
DAVENPORT	none	<0.20- 0.77 <0.20	0.15-0.27		
DECATUR	9/17	<0.20-0.59	0.00-0.20		
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20-0.39	0.00-0.20		
KANKAKEE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
LEXINGTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
MARION	8/21	<0.20-0.38	0.00-0.20		
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.10-0.23		, ,
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20 0.00-0.20		
MOUNT VERNON	7/04	<0.20-0.41	0.10-0.23		
MUNCIE	8/01	<0.20-0.54	0.05-0.21		
PIQUA	8/7+14	<0.20-0.23	0.01-0.20		
QUINCY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
RICHMOND	6/19	<0.20- 1.24	0.29-0.37		
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20	•	
TOLEDO	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20		
U OF IOWA	none		0.00-0.20		
WYACONDA	none		0.00-0.20		
YPSILANTI	none		0.00-0.20		
			3.20		

LOCATION	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*
BETHANY	9/25	<0.20-0.41	0.01-0.20
BLANCHESTER	7/24	<0.20-0.64	0.10-0.24
BREESE	6/14/85	<0.20- 0.37	0.04-0.20
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
CLARINDA	10/25	<0.20-0.27	0.01-0.20
COLUMBUS	6/12/85	<0.20- 0.90	0.27-0.36
DAVENPORT	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
DECATUR	5/06/85		0.01-0.20
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
LEXINGTON	05/01/85	<0.20-0.86	0.02-0.21
MARION	7/10	<0.20-0.35	0.12-0.24
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MOUNT VERNON	5/10	<0.20-0.62	0.10-0.23
MUNCIE	7/25	<0.20-1.62	0.11-0.26
PIQUA	7/24+31	<0.20-0.23	0.01-0.20
QUINCY	none		0.00-0.20
RICHMOND	6/19	<0.20-1.76	0.38-0.47
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	none		0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA	7/10		0.01-0.20
WYACONDA	none		0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	6/12	·	0.02-0.20

OW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; HE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

# TABLE 7 - TRIFLURALIN IN CWS

# FINISHED WATER

		*	
LOCATION RETHANY REANCHESTER REESE CHARLESTON CLARINDA COLUMBUS DAVENPORT DECATUR GREENVILLE KANKAKEE LEXINGTON MARION MI. CITY MONROE MOUNT VERNON MUNCIE	DATE OF MAX none none none none none none none non	RANGE OF CONC(PPB) <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20 <0.20	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20  0.00-0.20
	none		
KANKAKEE			
			0.00-0.20
	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
	none	<0.20	
	none	<0.20	
	none	<0.20	
PIQUA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
QUINCY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
RICHMOND	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
RCANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	
TCLEDO	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA	none		0.00-0.20
WYACONDA		<0.20	0.00-0.20
	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20

LOCATION	DATE OF MAX	RANGE OF CONC(PPB)	ANNUALIZED MEAN CONC*
BETHANY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
BLANCHESTER	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
BREESE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
CHARLESTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
CLARINDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
COLUMBUS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
DAVENPORT	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
DECATUR	8/13/85	<0.20-0.20	0.00-0.20
GREENVILLE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
KANKAKEE	6/18/85	<0.20-0.32	0.01-0.20
LEXINGTON	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MARION	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MI. CITY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MONROE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
MOUNT VERNON	12/10/85	<0.20-0.21	0.00-0.20
MUNCIE	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
PIQUA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
QUINCY	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
RICHMOND	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
ROANOKE RAPDS	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
TOLEDO	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
U OF IOWA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
WYACONDA	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20
YPSILANTI	none	<0.20	0.00-0.20

OW AMC VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.00 PPB; HIGH VALUE USED NONDETECT=0.20 PPB; HE LIMITS OF DETECTION WERE REPORTED AS 0.20 PPB

TABLE 8

MONSANTO 1985 GROUNDWATER MONITORING PROGRAM

OF SELECTED WELLS - SUMMARY OF POSITIVE SAMPLES

<u>LCCATION</u>	RANGE OF POSITIVE RESULTS FROM 243 WELLS SAMPLED JULY 1985 (PPB)	RANGE OF POSITIVE RESULTS FROM 246 WELLS SAMPLED OCT. 1985 (PPB)	TOTAL NUMBER OF POSITIVE WELLS AT SAMPLING LOCATION
•	ATRAZII	NE	
		•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	<0.22 - 1.4	0.80	4
Decatur, IN**	0.39 - 6.5**	2.0**	2
Crisp, GA	0.34	<u>-</u>	1
Dane, WI	0.34 - 1.1	0.34 - 1.7	7
	BUTYLAT	<u>°E</u>	
Miller, GA	0.38	+	. <b>1</b>
	CYANAZIN	<u>'E</u>	
Iroquois, IL**	4.5**		1
Tift, GA	0.27	<u>-</u>	1
Turner, GA	<0.23	-	1
e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	METOLACHL	OR	
Houston, AL	0.35	0.55	. 1
Kossuth, IA	0.22 - 0.28	-	6
Knox, IN	0.28 - 0.30	-	2
Pulaski, IN**	0.37**	-	1
Turner, GA	-	3.2	1
Hertford, NC**	<del>-</del>	48.0**	1

<sup>\*</sup>NOTE: "\*\*" Indicates Areas of High Concentration.

Results expressed as the Average of Duplicate Determinationa.

Limit of Detection was 0.20 ppb.

Results obtained with GC/ECD; not confirmed with

GC/MS for July 1985 samples, but confirmed with

GC/MS for Oct 1985 samples.

	T /	$\overline{}$	7501	STRATION D	IVISION DATA R	ETTEN FEC	CRD	<del></del>		/ <u>Ι</u> ΕΣ)
Switt. 110.:			—ro a	e used for	REVIEW OF STU	DIES PPA	CALLY-			9982 K
•	1	/,	Cor	nfidential	Rusiness Info	macion-				
		0	bes Not Co	mtain Nat	ional Security	Info. (I	.0. 120	065)	13/5, 100 mcv	
Frical name:	: /	ALACH	100		•		•		SHAUGNES	
		ICICA	LUX		<del></del>	Reg.	Stat.		( (EED/2017/255 )	0501
•						Revie	w		Study fama to	
dentifying		Refer-	Record	Study G	udeline		ssion		Acceptable (A)	1
		Mimber	Number	Marracia	re Description	Crite (SEE	TLA BET <i>CH</i> )	Accession Number	Unacceptable()	
090501	870	1.59	167		lecharo am				1	cher connert
<del></del>		701	/		J 1	<del>d</del> !		265683	<u> </u>	
				Drawns	Writer					
1	1			denega	ung Resul	<del>大</del>			,	
7 1			. 1		$\mathcal{L}$	10 20	1 11	1842		<del></del>
				La sel	cted Harli	- 1:	· 7	1094		<u> </u>
j		ı		-claus		<del></del>		<del></del>	1	
CEUCT MANAGES	R (EM) o	- REVIEW	MANAGER (	שא ספינא (אַה	MEER:			PM/RM TEAM	MEMBER AND NUMBER	•
3. ACC /20 (		<u>D</u>	AVID	GIAMI	ORCARO	RMT	7			<b>-</b>
) لندر خداد	ETA):	10/6	186	RD	ERAICH CHIEF	INITIALS	: X	×5		
ik applicare	£ 30X:	7 7						<del></del>		
ly(1es):	^	No.	res or no)	If yes,	please identif	ly the	DATE PRICE	SENT TO HED	ABODY TSS: 3-9	5-87
YLED YCLICAR	· Sp	ECIAL	REI	IIEW			PRO TE	CTED RETURN	n 5	~ 87
IRUCTIONS:				21C.W					DALE:	
- P	ease	nevi	ew A	m P	<del>} //</del>		DATE	RETURNED TO	RD (HED/BUD/TSS	PROVICE):
	0 -	4 5	00	010	4 4	<del></del>				•
	ken l	o la	rolyn	Uffle	11 June	aa				
<u>_</u>				00	Lut	neu	<del></del>			
				·		0			<del></del>	
SPS SSUM ON					*.					
-01 INS 200 	TESR(	CB /X/EA	B / 7553	RD:	7733	BUD:	<b>TEAB</b>	<b>7</b> 558		<i>i</i>
	713 <u>/</u> R	CB <u>X</u> TEA	8	RO:		BUD: A	<del>7 - 1</del>	<u></u>	FOR DATA SLEMI	
	<del></del>	CB <u>Ø</u> 7EA	B <u>/</u> /EE3		NUMBE	R OF ACT	CNS		A REGISTRATION	STANDARD:
TYPE OF R	EATEM.	CB <u>@</u> EA	B <u></u>			R OF ACT	CNS			STANDARD:
:	EATEM.	CB <u>//</u> EA	8 //223		NUMBE	R OF ACT	CNS		A REGISTRATION	STANDARD: on Criteria
TYPE CF R	A, EATEM		8 _7===		NUMBE	R OF ACT	CNS		A REGISTRATION Review Submiss: Policy No	STANDARD: on Criteria
TYPE OF R	EVIEW  V	:3	8 //223		NUMBE	R OF ACT	CNS		A REGISTRATION Review Submiss:	STANDARD: on Criteria te #31
TYPE CP R	EVIEW  V	:3	8 //223		NUMBE	R OF ACT	CNS		A REGISTRATION Review Submiss:  Policy No.  1 = data which 6(a)(2) on 3(c)(2)(B)	STANDARD: on Criteria. te #31
TYPE OF R Toxicolog Ecologica	EVIEW  J Effect hemistry	:s	# <u> </u>		NUMBE	R OF ACT	CNS		A REGISTRATION Review Submiss:  Policy No.  1 = data which 6(a)(2) or	STANDARD: on Criteria. te #31
TIPE OF R Toxicolog Ecologica Residue O	EVIEW  V  L Effect  Themistry  Assessme	es .	8 // 2003		NUMBE	R OF ACT	CNS Review		A REGISTRATION Review Submiss:  Policy No.  1 = data which 6(a)(2) on 3(c)(2)(B)	STANDARD: on Criteria ite F31 meet meet flagging
TYPE CF R TOXICOLOGICA Residue C Exposure Product C	EVIEW  V  L Effect  Themistry  Assessme	es .	## <b>** ** ** ** ** ** ** *</b>		NUMBE	R OF ACT	CNS Review		A REDISTRATION Review Submissi  Policy No  1 = data which 6(a)(2) or 3(c)(2)(B) criteria  2 = data of pa concern	STANDARD: on Criteria one Fil meet meet flagging orticular
TYPE CF R TOXICOLOG Ecologica Residue C Exposure Product C Efficacy	EVIEW  I Effect  Chemistry  Assessment	at .			NUMBE	R OF ACT	CNS Review		A REGISTRATION Review Submissi  Policy No.  1 = data which 6(a)(2) or 3(c)(2)(B) criteria  2 = data of pa concern  3 = data neces determine	STANDARD: on Criteria on Criteria onet meet flagging orticular sary to- tiered
TYPE CF R TOXICOLOGICA Residue C Exposure Product C	EVIEW  I Effect hemistry Assessme	at .			NUMBE	Special	CNS Review		A REDISTRATION Review Submiss:  Policy No.  1 = data which 6(a)(2) or 3(c)(2)(B) criteria  2 = data of pa concern  3 = data neces determine testing re	STANDARD: on Criteria one Fil meet meet flagging orticular stary to-
TYPE OF R Toxicolog Ecologica Residue O Exposure Product O Efficacy Precaution	EVIEW  I Effect  hemistry  Assessme  hemistry  nary Lab	eling/Acu			NUMBE	Special	CNS Review		A REGISTRATION Review Submissi  Policy No.  1 = data which 6(a)(2) or 3(c)(2)(B) criteria  2 = data of pa concern  3 = data neces determine	STANDARD: on Criteria  ite F31  meet flagging  rticular  sary to- tiered quirements

٠.

ASSETT NO.:			TO	ISTRATION RE USED R	OR REVIEW OF ST	marc and	CALL OF	_	_	(HED PROVIDE)
			· ·						. >	PACK No.:
					al Business Info ational Security			065)		1/5/27 1
PERKLENAM		<u> </u>	•						~	(RD RCVIDE)
1 _ AL 1047		HLAC	HLOR							SHAUGNESSY NO.
		-	•			Reg. Revie				O/BUD/TSS Complete)
		Refer-		Study	Guideline		ssion			iy found to be extable (A)/
hoifying	Action Code	ence Number	Record Number	Normat	or Tive Description	Crite	ria BELCW)	Accession	1 Unac	cceptable(U) for
		Number	87.391			1	EE:LW)	Number		lew or reviewer comment
	770		01,511	1985	Surface an	rd		265673	? [	
	į			1200	eduates					
1	·		·	Secon	ring Pasel	4				
<u> </u>				i	lected Herbici	1				<u> </u>
			•	for se	leded Perfect	dea				miner i i i suma e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del>                                     </del>	<del></del>				$\dashv$	
OCT MANAG	ER (2M) (	or REVIE	MANAGER W	(RM) AND	NUMBER: RM 79			PM/RM TEAM	MEMBER	AND NUMBER:
.ಷ.೭./೭೦	(EPA):		AMPOR	L <i>H KO</i> i	RD BRANCH CHIEF	INITIALS	· &	{		
K APPLICA	FILE POY	10/6	: 6	<u>1</u>		<del></del>	7.	<u> </u>		
								•		
	/ Adverse	= 6(a)(	2) Data (4	05,406)	Product S	pecific D	eta (Re	registrati	lon) (65)	5,656)
	7 Suspect	Data	(4	15,416)	Generic D	ata (Rere	gistrat	ion) (660,	,661)	•
	7 IBT Dat	ta .	(1	85 486)	M Special R	eview Dat	a (870	871)		21
	, 201, 201		. "	3	7-7 Special III	CIICH DEG	u (0,0,			All-
37 CP (210)	IVIDUAL S	TUDIES .	SUBATTED:	7	(4 Volum	20)	TO EE	COMPLETE	BY RSE	7.B
ANY CF TO	- ALCVE									
POR	REVIEW?	(circle	(in whole	or in pa	rt) BEEN PREVIO	USLY	DATE	SENT TO HE		5 81
FOR CELLI	REVIEW?	(circle	(in whole : yes or n	or in pa o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO , please identi	USLY	DATE	SENT TO HE		ss: 1- 5-87
ITTED FOR y(les):	REVIEW?	(circle	(in whole : yes or n	or in pa o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO	USLY	DATE	SENT TO HE		
TITED FOR y(les): LED ACTION	REVIEW?	(circle	(in whole : yes or n	or in pa o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO	USLY	DATE	SENT TO HE	₹:	4-5-87
ITED FOR 7(1es): LED ACTION	REVIEW?	(circle	(in whole	or in pa o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO	USLY	DATE PRICE PROJE	SENT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RELUR	R: EN DATE:	4-5-87
ITED FOR 7(1es): LED ACTION	REVIEW?  No.	(circle	: yes or n	o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO , please identi	USLY	DATE PRICE PROJE	SENT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RELUR	R: EN DATE:	
ITED FOR 7(1es): LED ACTION	REVIEW?	(circle	: yes or n	o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO	USLY	DATE PRICE PROJE	SENT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RELUR	R: EN DATE:	4-5-87
TITED FOR y(les): LED ACTION	REVISION NO	(circle	: yes or n	o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO , please identi	USLY	DATE PRICE PROJE	SENT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RELUR	R: EN DATE:	4-5-87
POR ACTION PURILENS:	REVISION NO	(circle	: yes or n	o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO , please identi	USLY	DATE PRICE PROJE	SENT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RELUR	R: EN DATE:	4-5-87
POR ACTION POR ACTION PURTICENS:	REVISION NO SECOND 4	(circle	: yes or n	o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO , please identi	USLY	DATE PRICE PROJE	SENT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RELUR	R: EN DATE:	4-5-87
POR ACTION POR ACTION PUCTIONS:	REVIEW NO	(circle	een f	o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	USLY fy the	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	R: EN DATE:	4-5-87
POR ACTION RUCTIONS:	REVIEW NO	(circle	: yes or n	o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	USLY fy the  BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RELUR	RN DATE:	4-5-87 ED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):
PORTIONS:	REVIEW NO	(circle	een f	o) If yes	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	USLY fy the	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SENT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	ED ACE:	4-5-87  ED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):  DATA SUBMITTED UNDER
POR ACTION POR ACTION PUCTIONS:	REVISION NO CONTRACTOR NO CONT	(circle	een f	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	RY DATE: TO RD (HI	4-5-87 ED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):
POR ACTION RUCTIONS:	REVIEW	(circle	een f	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	RY DATE: TO RD (HI	4-5-87  ED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):  DATA SUBMITTED UNDER DISTRATION STANDARD:  W Submission Criteria
POR ACTION RUCTIONS:  PAS SENT T  //SIS /  TYPE OF	REVIEW	(circle	een f	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	R: RN DATE: RO RD (HI FOR A RI Revie	DATA SUBMITTED UNDER DISTRATION STANDARD:  Policy Note #31
POR J(1es):  ED ACTION RUCTIONS:  AS SENT T	REVIEW	(circle	een f	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	R: RN DATE: RO RD (HI FOR A RI Revie	4-5-87  ED/BUD/TSS PROVIDE):  DATA SUBMITTED UNDER DISTRATION STANDARD:  W Submission Criteria
POR POR PORTIONS:  PUCTIONS:  PUC	REVIEW  REVIEW  Cal Effect	(circle	een f	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	R: RN DATE: RO RD (HI FOR A RI Revie	DATA SUBMITTED UNDER EGISTRATION STANDARD:  W Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31  data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging
TYPE OF    Testique	REVIEW  Chemistr	(circle	een f	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	R: RN DATE: RO RD (HI FOR A RI Revie	DATA SUBMITTED UNDER DISTRATION STANDARD: EW Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31  data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet
TYPE OF    Testique	REVIEW  Chemistr  Assessm	(circle	een f	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	FOR A REVIO	DATA SUBMITTED UNDER EGISTRATION STANDARD:  W Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31  data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging
TYPE OF  Toxicold   Ecological	REVIEW  O:  TTB //  REVIEW  Chemistr  Assessm	(circle	een f	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	FOR A REVISE	DATA SUBMITTED UNDER EGISTRATION STANDARD:  W Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31  data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria  data of particular
POR POR Y(1es):  POCTIONS:  POCTI	REVIEW OCY Chemistr Chemistr	RCB M	een f	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	FOR A REVISE	DATA SUBMITTED UNDER DISTRATION STANDARD: W Submission Criteria Policy Note #31 data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria data of particular concern
POR POR Y(1es):  POSTIONS:  POSTIONS:  POSTIONS:  POSTIONS:  POSTIONS:  POSTIONS:  POSTIONS:  POSTIONS:  POSTIONS:  Product  Product  Product	REVIEW  Chemistr  Chemistr  Chemistr	RCB M	EAB //EFF	n (mc	rt) BEEN PREVIO, please identi	BUD:	DATE PRICE PROJE DATE	SEMT TO HE LITY NUMBER CTED RETUR RETURNED T	FOR A RI Revie  3 =	DATA SUBMITTED UNDER DISTRATION STANDARD: w Submission Criteria  Policy Note #31  data which meet 6(a)(2) or meet 3(c)(2)(B) flagging criteria  data of particular concern  data necessary to determine tiered